

## REMARKS

### Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-100 are pending in this application.

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13-18, 20, 23-25, 26-30, 32-34, 36, 38-43, 45, 48-55, 57-59, 61, 63-68, 70, 73-80, 82-84, 86, 88-93, 95, and 98-100 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,240,555 ("Shoff").

Claims 6, 31, 56, and 81 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,594,661 ("Bruner"). Claims 10, 12, 35, 37, 60, 62, 85, and 87 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,551 ("Swix"). Claims 19, 44, 69, and 94 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,809 ("Kambayashi"). Claims 21, 46, 71, and 96 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,696,905 ("Reimer"). Claims 22 and 47 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff in view of Reimer and U.S. Patent No. 5,987,509 ("Portuesi"). Claims 72 and 97 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff in view of Portuesi.

### Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 26, 51, and 76 in order to more particularly define the claimed invention. No new matter has been added and the claims are fully supported by the originally-filed application. (See, e.g., applicants' specification at paragraphs 38, 44, 48, 49 and 56.)

The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

#### Applicants' Reply

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 26, 51, and 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shoff. The Examiner rejected claims 2-25, 27-50, 52-75 and 77-100 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Shoff in view of various combinations of Bruner, Swix, Kambayashi, Reimer and Portuesi ("secondary references"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants' invention, as defined by amended independent claims 1, 26, 51 and 76, is directed to systems, a method, and processor readable medium for providing on-demand media with supplemental content in an interactive television application. The systems, method, and processor readable medium include, *inter alia*, a user equipment device that receives a request for on-demand media from a user and transmits the request to a remote server. The remote server receives the request and identifies supplemental content that is related to the on-demand media in response to the request. The remote server retrieves the identified supplemental content and provides the on-demand media and the supplemental content to the user equipment device in response to the request.

Shoff discusses an interactive entertainment system. A viewer computing unit determines whether a program on a channel is interactive and contains supplemental content by checking for the presence of a target specification in the EPG data field 58 (Shoff, col. 8, line 62 to col. 9, line 8). The viewer computing unit then retrieves the supplemental content based on the target specification from headend 22 (Shoff, col. 9, lines 20-25).

The Examiner contends that Shoff shows every feature of applicants' independent claims (Office Action, pp. 2-3, 6).

First, applicants respectfully submit that Shoff does not show or suggest transmitting a request for on-demand media from a user equipment device to a remote server, as defined by applicants' claims 1, 26, 51 and 76. Instead, although the Shoff system can be operated in an on-demand mode, nowhere does Shoff show or suggest a request for on-demand media being transmitted from the user device to a remote server (Shoff, col. 4, line 62 to col. 5, line 1). Moreover, the transmission of a request for supplemental content in Shoff is not the same as applicants' claimed transmission of a request for on-demand media. Furthermore, merely tuning to a channel to receive on-demand content in Shoff does not necessarily cause the transmission of a request for on-demand media, as required by applicants' claims.

Second, even if Shoff did transmit a request for on-demand media to a remote server (which it does not), Shoff would still fail to show or suggest that the remote server identifies supplemental content related to the on-demand media in response to the request, as defined by applicants' claims 1, 26, 51 and 76. This is because in Shoff the viewer computing unit determines the existence and headend location of the supplemental content and thus, Shoff does not show or suggest the remote server identifying supplemental content related to requested on-demand media. Moreover, because in Shoff the headend receives requests for supplemental content and not for on-demand media, the headend in Shoff cannot identify supplemental content related to the on-demand media, as required by applicants' claims.

None of the secondary references, cited by the Examiner as allegedly showing other limitations of applicants' claims, makes up for the deficiencies of Shoff relative to the rejection.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 26, 51, and 76 and claims 2-25, 27-50, 52-75, and 77-100 which depend, directly or indirectly from claim 1, 26, 51, or 76 are patentable.

#### Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gall C. Gotfried/  
Gall C. Gotfried  
Registration No. 58,333  
Agent for Applicants  
ROPES & GRAY LLP  
Customer No. 75563